



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/051,221	01/18/2002	Kazuya Kishimoto	P6545a	7176
20178	7590	02/02/2006	EXAMINER	
EPSON RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT INC INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPT 150 RIVER OAKS PARKWAY, SUITE 225 SAN JOSE, CA 95134			TIV, BACKHEAN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2151	

DATE MAILED: 02/02/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/051,221	KISHIMOTO, KAZUYA
	Examiner Backhean Tiv	Art Unit 2151

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11/14/05.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____.

Detailed Action

Claims 1-11 are pending in this application. This is a response to the RCE filed on 11/14/05.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 10 and 11 is not limited to tangible embodiments. In view of Applicant's disclosure, the medium is not limited to tangible embodiments, instead being defined as including both tangible embodiments and intangible embodiments. As such, the claim is not limited to statutory subject matter and is therefore non-statutory. The applicant is advised to amend the claims, to " a computer-readable medium".

Claim Objections

Claim 10 is objected to because of the following informalities:

As per claim 10, recites, "the second the work-flow system". The claim should read, "the second work-flow system".

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

As per claim 1-11, recites, "the command is used to activate the work flow", it is unclear to which work flow the command is used to activate, e.g. first or second.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-2,4-8,10,11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 6,385,640 issued to Yamamoto et al.(Yamamoto) in view of US Publication 2001/0003827 issued to Shimamura.

As per claim 1,6,7,10,11, Yamamoto teaches a work-flow cooperation processing apparatus that achieves cooperation among at least two work-flow systems, comprising:
a first work-flow systems including a first computer apparatus serving as a work-flow server(Abstract, Figs. 5);

an electronic-mail storage that stores an electronic mail sent from the first work-flow system(Fig.5),

a second work-flow system including a second computer apparatus serving as a work-flow server(Abstract, Fig.5, col.6, lines 10-15);

a method-server apparatus that reads the electronic mail from the electronic mail storage and determines whether the electronic mail relates to the second work-flow system(Fig.5, col.6, lines 10-15);

Yamamoto, does not explicitly teach the electronic mail including a command; wherein the method-server apparatus transmits the command to the second computer apparatus when the command relates to a work flow in the second work-flow system, and the second computer apparatus executes the work flow corresponding to the command in the second work-flow flow system.

Shimamura teaches the electronic mail including a command(Fig.4,5,7,8);wherein the method-server apparatus transmits the command to the second computer apparatus when the command relates to a work flow in the second work-flow system, the command is used to activate the work flow, and the second computer apparatus executes the work flow corresponding to the command in the second work-flow flow system(Figs.4,5,7,8, paragraph 022, claim 1).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Yamamoto to add a command in an email to be performed by another computer in another work flow system as taught by Shimamura in order to remotely perform maintenance for devices in a network(Shimamura, paragraph 0001).

One ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Yamamoto and Shimamura in order to provide a system to remotely perform maintenance for devices in a network(Shimamura, paragraph 0001).

As per claim 2,8, wherein the first computer apparatus sends the electronic mail for storage in the electronic-mail storage when electronic-mail processing is designated at a node of a work flow in the first work-flow system, and the first computer apparatus does not send the electronic mail when electronic mail processing is not designated at the node of the work flow in the first work-flow system(Yomamoto, col.6, lines 53-65; it is inherent that if an email is not addressed to a specific person that it will not send the email).

As per claim 4, wherein the command is an activation command that activates the work flow in the second work-flow system (Yomamoto, Fig.5, col.5, lines 64-67).

As per claim 5, wherein the electronic mail has text data, and the text data includes a parameter specifying the work flow in the second work-flow system(Yomamoto, col.6, lines 1-22).

Claims 3,9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 6,385,640 issued to Yamamoto et al.(Yamamoto) in view of US Publication 2001/0003827 issued to Shimamura in further view of Office Notice.

Yamamoto in view of Shimamura teaches all the limitations of claim 1, and 7, and further teaches as per claim 3,9 wherein the method-server apparatus transmits the command to the second computer apparatus when the electronic mail is related to the work flow in the second work-flow system(col.6, lines 1-15;the 1st system determines that the email is related to the second work flow system).

Yamamoto in view of Shimamura however, does not teach deleting email from a mail storage. Office Notice is taken; one ordinary skill in the art would delete an email from a mail storage when the email is read or unwanted to save memory or storage space.

One ordinary skilled in the art would be motivated to combine Yamamoto in view of Shimamura and to delete email from a mail storage to provide a system to save storage space on a computer.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-11 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See PTO-892.

US 6,629,131 issued to Choi

US 5,974,392 issued to Endo

US 5,938,722 issued to Johnson

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Backhean Tiv whose telephone number is (571)272-3941. The examiner can normally be reached on 9 A.M.-12 P.M. and 1 -6 P.M. Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Zarni Maung can be reached on (571) 272-3939. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Backhean Tiv
2151
1/30/06


ZARNI MAUNG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER